



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

preceding century. Whatever may be true as to the general use of the term *précieux*, it can be proved beyond question that the *thing* was flourishing in all its ramifications long before 1650, long before d'Aubigné, in 1615, made sport of it,¹⁵ long before Charles Sorel observed its growth or the so-called Somaize chronicled its history, long before the Italian *prezioso* or the Spanish *precioso* became fashionable. Nor did it disappear after the first performance of the *Précieuses ridicules*, November 18, 1659, when Ménage, not a little addicted to *préciosité* himself, said, as he took Chapelain by the hand: "Monsieur—nous approuvions vous & moi toutes les sottises qui viennent d'être critiquées si finement, & avec tant de bon sens, mais croyez-moi, pour me servir de ce que S. Remi dit à Clovis; il nous faudra brûler ce que nous avons adoré, & adorer ce que nous avons brûlé."¹⁶ His prediction that the "galimatias" and the "style forcé" had come to an end had as much validity as all predictions which forecast a radical change in conditions based on perennially recurring circumstances.

No succeeding period in French literary or social history has been exempt from the evil. Each recrudescence has constituted a reaction against the homely speech of France. When this has not been done for reasons of invidious distinction, it has been done for motives of true poetic significance.

J. WARSHAW.

University of Missouri.

HENRY VIII IN HALL'S *CHRONICLE*

Hall's authorship of the history of Henry VIII, in the *Chronicle* that passes under his name, seems never to have been called in question, though the doubt that he could have written it lies on the surface. Mr. Whibley remarks that up to the death of Henry VII, "Hall is a chronicler after the fashion of Holinshed and Stow,"—who of course had not yet written their chronicles when Hall's was published. "He accepted the common authorities," continues Mr. Whibley, "and translated them into his own ornate

¹⁵ D'Aubigné, *Foeneeste* (Flammarion, 1896), pp. 239-240.

¹⁶ *Ménagiana*, II, pp. 65-66.

English, or embellished them with new words and strange images. With the accession of Henry VIII he began a fresh and original work. Henceforth, he wrote only of what he saw and thought from day to day. And, in thus writing, he revealed most clearly what manner of man he was" (*Cambridge History of English Literature*, III, 359. See also Mr. Whibley's separate edition of Henry VIII, London, 1904).

It seems highly improbable that any such sudden conversion as Mr. Whibley supposes could have taken place. If anything, the importance of his subject might be supposed to have incited Hall, if he had written the history of Henry VIII, to more ambitious efforts in the way of what Ascham calls his "indenture English." But the probabilities are that Hall was not responsible for the literary form of the history of Henry VIII. The evidence for this statement is partly bibliographical, partly internal, and partly external. The first edition of Hall's *Chronicle* was apparently published in 1542, though no copy of this edition is now extant. Tanner, *Bibliotheca*, in his account of Hall, gives 1542 as the date of publication of the first edition, and Berthelet as the publisher. In his description of this book, Tanner states that it extended "a tempore sc. Henrici IV. ad unionem per connubium Henrici VII cum Elizabetha filia Edwardi IV." He then adds that it was continued by Richard Grafton in a second edition to the death of Henry VIII, his words being: "Continuavit etiam ad mortem Henrici VIII Ric. Graftonus typographus ex mss. Halli. Lond. MDXLVIII. fol. edit. per Grafton." And finally he calls attention to a third edition, edited by Grafton and published in 1550. This was the fullest version of Hall's *Chronicle* to appear. Tanner provides another piece of information which helps to explain the complete disappearance of the first edition of the *Chronicle*. He records the fact that the *Chronicle* was suppressed by royal authority in 1555 (citing Fox, p. 1547), the reason for this, not stated by Tanner, being that the strong Reformation tone of the *Chronicle* was offensive to the Catholic party of Mary.

A possible fragmentary survival from this first edition is contained in the Grenville collection in the British Museum. In the catalog of this collection (*Bibliotheca Grenvilliana*, I, 297) a copy is described as giving the date 1548 at the Colophon, p. 264 (i. e. after Henry VIII), yet "the variations from the press of the

other copies with that date, and the earlier and older character of the decorations of the Capital letters seem to prove that the main body of this copy makes part of an edition which Tanner ascribes to Berthelet in 1542." This seems therefore to be a copy of the 1542 edition filled out by the addition of the life of Henry VIII from the 1548 edition.

Hall died in 1547. The following year Grafton issued his edition of the *Chronicle*, to be followed two years later by a second edition. In his preface Grafton remarks that Hall in his later years was not so "painful and studious" as he had been. He then adds that Hall finished his *Chronicle* to the year 1532 (which would of course cover the early years of Henry VIII, where the style seems least like Hall's), and that he left a number of notes, which Grafton says he put together without any additions of his own. Now this latter statement is demonstrably not true, since there are statements in the history of Henry VIII that must have been written after Hall's death (see Gairdner, *Lollardy and the Reformation*, II, 201-202). Just what Grafton meant by putting together the story of the reign of Henry VIII can best be seen by comparing this part of the *Chronicle* with the earlier parts. Evidently he composed it entirely in his own manner. When he says that Hall had finished the reign of Henry VIII to 1532, he probably means that Hall had collected materials to that date, but that in his less "painful and studious" years, he had remitted his diligence for the later years of Henry's reign.

This explanation of the origin of the two parts of Hall's *Chronicle* seems to meet all requirements. It accounts for the very different styles of the two parts. Comparison of the history of Henry VIII in Hall's *Chronicle* with Grafton's style in his own *Chronicle at Large* shows that they are not dissimilar. The man who wrote the *Chronicle at Large* might very well have written the history of Henry VIII; but it seems impossible to believe that the author of the earlier parts of Hall's *Chronicle* could have written the Henry VIII. The two parts differ not only in style, but in the fundamentals of their two points of view with respect to government and politics. Hall's attitude towards affairs was always legal, and he showed little interest in the popular side of events. Grafton's narrative, on the other hand, is about four times as long as the average for the reigns of earlier kings, is full of picturesque detail,

shows much more interest in popular activities, and on the whole is more human and less professional. Moreover, if Hall's purpose was to write the history of the union of the two noble and illustrious families of York and Lancaster, as his title declares, he did not need to write about Henry VIII. If his purpose was to tell "the actes done" in the struggle for supremacy, there would be no point in telling of the reign of Henry VIII. The *finis* at the end of the reign of Henry VII,—the ends of the reigns of preceding kings are not so marked,—indicates the real conclusion of Hall's work. What comes after is continuation by Grafton, based perhaps in part on Hall's materials, but not composed and put in form by Hall.

It follows, then, that the credit for the best writing in Hall's *Chronicle* is to be assigned not to Hall but to Grafton. The share of the latter in the 1548 edition of Hall was probably known to John Bale, who might have settled the whole question by being a little more specific. In his edition of Leland's *Laboryouse Journey*, made in 1549, he writes of Hall's *Chronicle* as follows, his point being that some one should complete Leland's work, left unfinished at his death: "Many noble workes we reade of, that were left unperfyght, as their fyrst authors were prevented of deathe, yet for theyr utilite they have bene fynished by other good men. As now in oure tyme, the Epitome of Chronicles begunne by Thomas Lanquet, was laboriously folowed and profytably ended by Thomas Cooper, a man worthy of continual prayse for so studious labours. The lyke also may be sayd of hym that brought to lyghte the great worke of Edwarde Halle. The Lord dayly prosper so profytable affayres." The person who "brought to lyghte the great worke of Edwarde Halle," could scarcely have been any other than Grafton, whose edition had appeared the preceding year.

GEORGE PHILIP KRAPP.

Columbia University.
